

Questions

use of the Palais station in the city of Quebec for all passenger trains; the Canadian National having a half interest in this property.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The cost, to the Canadian National, of the Toronto Terminals Railway station at Toronto, including the grade separation work done by the Toronto Terminals Railway, will be \$11,808,085. The Canadian National Railways' share of the cost of grade separation and other works which are exclusively C.N.R. will be \$1,602,298.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—RECEIPTS, 1928

Mr. MATTHEWS:

1. What is amount of money received by the Department of National Revenue for Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928, for:

(1) All customs duties and taxes provided by the Customs Act and tariff of Canada with amendments and by the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and amending acts on, (a) imported spirits; (b) imported wines; (c) imported ale, beer, porter and stout.

(2) All excise and sales taxes levied under the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act with amending acts and the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, with amending acts on, (a) Canadian potable spirits; (b) Canadian non-potable and denatured spirits; (c) Canadian wines; (d) Canadian ale, beer, porter and stout?

2. What is amount of money received by the Department of National Revenue for Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1928, for:

(1) All customs duties and taxes provided by the Customs Act and tariff of Canada with amendments and by the Special War Revenue Act 1915 and amending acts on imported spirits, wines, ale, beer, porter and stout, which were exported from Canada.

(2) All excise and sales taxes levied under the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act with amending acts and the Special War Revenue Act 1915 with amending acts on Canadian potable spirits, Canadian wines and Canadian ale, beer, porter and stout which were exported from Canada?

Mr. EULER:

1. (1) Collections of customs duties and excise taxes on imports of spirits, wines and ale, beer, porter, etc., fiscal year ended March, 1928:—

	Customs Duties	Excise Taxes
Spirits.. . . .	\$22,965,183	
Wines.. . . .	1,757,872	
Ale, beer, porter, etc.	95,029	\$ 28,751

(2) Collections of excise duties and excise taxes on spirits, wines and domestic beer, fiscal year ended March, 1928:—

[Mr Dunning.]

	Excise Duties	Excise Taxes
Potable spirits... ..	\$17,104,208	
Non-potable spirits..	1,157,205	
Wines.. . . .		\$ 170,987
Ale, beer, porter, etc.	234,220	6,320,590
Malt.. . . .	4,274,966	

Sales tax collections are not recorded, as applied to separate commodities, and returns are not available of sales taxes collected on beer, spirits and wines.

2. (1 and 2) The department has no record of customs or excise revenues collected on domestic or imported spirits, which were exported from Canada subsequent to customs or excise entry.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—PUBLICATIONS AND DISTRIBUTION

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many men employed in the Department of Agriculture, publications and distribution branch, Daly building, are receiving a salary of twenty dollars (\$20) per week, or less?

2. What are their salaries and duties respectively?

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Eleven at present, but the majority are only employed for a short period during the distribution of special publications.

2. All these men are paid \$17.10 per week. Their duties consist of filling and sealing envelopes ready for mailing, handling and opening packages of publications received from the printing bureau, and general labouring work. Occasionally they may be required to carry messages.

LOWER DETROIT RIVER CONTRACTS

Mr. GOTT:

1. Is it a fact that the Department of Marine and Fisheries refuses to acknowledge representations that have been made to them, after five years of sealed contracts for light and buoy service in the lower Detroit river; that they still refuse to put up same for tender in re-letting the contract which expires April 1, 1929?

2. Has the department received requests to have same let by tender?

3. Has the department received communications re letting contract from any other than present contractor?

4. Is it a fact that a communication regarding same, dated February 26th, was not answered by the department until March 13th and then only after another communication from the same party under date of March 10th had been received?

5. Has the government an offer from a reputable party, well equipped for the work, to perform the contract at less than the present contract price?